

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment claims 1-3 and 5-11 will be pending, of which claims 1, 5, and 11 are independent.

Drawings

The Examiner requested that new drawings be submitted because the drawings as submitted were hand written. In response Applicants have submitted corrected drawings. Thus, Applicants request withdrawal of Examiner's objection to the drawings.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5, and 12 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response and to more clearly set forth Applicants' invention claim 5 has been amended and claims 4 and 12 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the Examiner's rejection moot. Thus, Applicants request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of claim 5.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by HP OpenView bundled with CA UniCenter TNG (herein combined as the "UniCenter"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The UniCenter reference specifically teaches distribution of the latest version of software to target systems. The automation process for installation of software disclosed or taught by the UniCenter reference is specifically targeted at automation of "the task of analyzing each target machine by performing a series of checks between the target machine and the software that is to be installed . . . to ensure all file systems used during the installation are mounted and available." *See UniCenter at page 181 first paragraph.* The automated analysis occurs prior to installation of the software program. For example, the analysis also includes evaluation of the disk space on the target prior to installation of the software program. Thus, the automation process disclosed in UniCenter reference is specifically focused on assessing the target machine to receive the software prior to initiating the installation process. The UniCenter reference neither teaches nor suggests automation of the installation process including monitoring for commands or requests that require "user intervention" and responding to commands or requests "without requiring user

intervention" as set forth in independent claims 1, 5, and 11, and thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie basis for an anticipation rejection. As a result claims 1, 5, and 11 should be allowed. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 5, and 11 and full allowance of same.

While claims 2 and 3 also provide independent basis for allowance, claims 2 and 3 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and hence are also in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 3 and full allowance of same.

While claims 6-10 also provide independent basis for allowance, claims 6-10 depend from and further limit independent claim 5 and hence are also in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of claims 6-10 and full allowance of same.

In view of the foregoing and because all rejections have been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees that may be required relative to this application, or credit any overpayment, to our Account 50-2213, Order No. 069509-0302126 (Pctel-12847).

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: 

Jubin Dana Reg. No. 41,400
Customer No. 27498

2475 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1115
Tel. No.: (650) 233-4661
Fax No.: (650) 233-4545

60355142-1

5 of 5